

**REMARKS**

At the outset, Applicants gratefully note the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter for claims 4, 17, 23 and 26 (it should be noted here that claim 26 has been changed so that claim 26 now depends from claim 22). It is respectfully requested that rewriting these claims in independent form be held in abeyance in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Prior to the present response, claims 1-28 were pending. By way of the above amendments, claims 1, 6, 19 and 24-28 have been amended, and new claims 29-30 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-30 currently are pending.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the camera main body includes a detector for detecting a condition of a proper connection of said image sensing unit to a connector of the camera body, that a power supply controller operates to selectively control power supply in said camera body, and that the selection is determined in accordance with a result of the detection. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the original disclosure, for instance, in the description at page 9, line 22 to page 13, line 26, page 14, line 12 to page 24, line 1, and page 22, line 22 to page 35, line 18 of the specification, and in Figures 1-3, 6-8, 10 and 13-20.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite that the digital camera has a connector, that an image sensing device having a taking lens and an image sensing device is connectable to the camera via the connector, and that the detector is operative to recognize an interface type from a condition of connection of said interface to the connector. Support for this amendment is also found throughout the original disclosure, for instance, in the exemplary embodiments described in page 9, line 24 to page 17, line 1, page, and with reference to Figures 5-10 and 13-20.

The amendment to claim 19 recites that the power source control method is in a digital camera having a connector to which each of a plurality of detachable device types, including an image sensing unit having a taking lens and an image sensing device, is replaceably connectable, and that the step of detecting detects a condition of connection of a detachable device to the digital camera and includes identifying the type of device connected

to the connector of the camera. Support for the amendment to claim 19 is found, for example, in the exemplary embodiments described in the specification at page 12, line 20 to page 14, line 13, page 16, line 13 to page 7, line 1, and page 24, line 10 to page 35, line 11, and in Figures 1-3, 8-10 and 14-20.

New claims 29 and 30 find support in at least page 22, line 22 to page 35, line 11 of the specification, and Figures 9, 10, and 13-20.

The Office Action objected to claims 24-27 for recited the same subject matter as claims 2-5, respectively. In response, Applicants have changed the dependencies of claims 24-27 to either directly or indirectly depend from claim 22. Applicants believe these amendments render moot the objection to claims 24-27.

**Applicants' Priority Date Overcomes the Date of the Sato Reference**

The Office Action includes a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of claims 6-10 and 19-21, as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,167,208 to Sato in view of the Arai et al. patent, a Section 103 rejection of claims 11-14, 18 and 22, as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,046,769 to Ikeda et al. in view of the Sato and Arai et al. patents, and a Section 103 rejection of claims 15 and 16, as allegedly being unpatentable over Ikeda et al. in view of Sato and Japanese publication no. 10-079874 to Kido. The October 30, 1998 U.S. filing date of the Sato patent, however, occurs after the foreign priority date of Applicants' priority document H10-216709, filed in Japan on July 31, 1998. To perfect Applicants' claim for benefit of priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, Applicants submit herewith a Declaration and Verified Translation, which includes a verified English language translation of the priority document. Applicants respectfully submit that this translation is accurate.

It is respectfully submitted that the attached verified translation, along with Applicants' claim for priority benefits in the Declaration and Power of Attorney, filed on July 30, 1999, and their submission of the certified copy in the Claim for Convention Priority, filed on October 6, 1999, are sufficient to overcome the date of the Sato patent. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 6-16 and 18-22 based on Sato be withdrawn.

**The Yamagishi Patent Does Not Disclose All Features of the Amended Claims**

The Office Action includes a rejection of claims 6, 10, 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,854,875 to Yamagishi. To the extent that the Office may consider this rejection to apply to amended claims 6 and 19, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that the digital camera has a connector, that an image sensing device having a taking lens and an image sensing device is connectable to the camera via the connector, and that the detector is operative to recognize an interface type from a condition of connection of the interface to the connector. In contrast, the Yamagishi patent discloses a camera in which a control circuit 50 detects a type of recording medium attached to the camera via connectors 90, 92, and controlling a power inhibiting operation with respect to recording in a recording medium if the supply of charge in the battery supply is insufficient for that medium. The Yamagishi patent does not, however, disclose the claimed connector operative to receive an image sensor including a taking lens and an image sensing device, as claimed. As a result, Yamagishi does not disclose any detector that is operable to detect a type of interface from a condition of connection of an interface to this connector. Yamaguchi therefore does not disclose the combination of all features recited in claim 6.

Amended claim 19 recites similar distinctions not disclosed in Yamagishi. For instance, claim 19 is directed to a power source control method in a camera having a connector to which each of a plurality of detachable device types, *including an image sensing unit having a taking lens and an image sensing device*, is replaceably connectable. The method includes, *inter alia*, the step of detecting a condition of connection of a detachable device to the digital camera, wherein said detecting a condition comprises identifying the type of device connected to the connector of the camera. As pointed out above, the Yamagishi patent does not disclose a connector operative to receive an image sensor including a taking lens and an image sensing device. Consequently, Yamagishi does not disclose identifying any one of a plurality of connectable devices to such a connector.

For at least these reasons, claims 6 and 19 are patentably distinguished from the Yamagishi patent. Claims 10 and 21 respectively depend from claims 6 and 19 and are therefore patentable at least for the above reasons, and further for the additional features recited. Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**The Amended Claims Are Not Taught or Suggested by the Ikeda et al. and Arai Patents**

The Office Action includes a rejection of claims 1, 5 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as allegedly being obvious over Ikeda et al. and Arai et al. patents. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, insofar as it may be considered to apply to the amended claims.

Starting with claim 27, Applicants submit that the rejection of this claim has been rendered moot by the above amendments in which the dependency of this claim has been changed from claim 1 to claim 22. Furthermore, claim 22 is believed allowable because, as noted above, Applicants' foreign priority date predates the filing date of the Sato patent applied to reject of claim 22. Hence, claim 27 also is allowable, if for no other reason than its dependence from allowable claim 22.

Turning now to amended claim 1, the digital camera recited therein includes, *inter alia*, a detector for detecting a condition of a proper connection of said image sensing unit to a connector of said camera body, and a power supply controller operates to selectively control power supply in said camera body. The selective control of the power supply is determined in accordance with a result of the detection. It is respectfully submitted that neither the Ikeda et al. patent nor the Arai et al. patent teach or suggest these features as set forth in amended claim 1, regardless of whether these documents are considered individually or in any combination.

As correctly acknowledged in the Office Action, the Ikeda et al. patent does not mention or suggest a detector for detecting a condition of connection of the image sensing unit to the camera body. Hence, not only does the Ikeda et al. patent fail to teach or suggest the claimed detector, but it also fails to describe the claimed selective control of power supply based on a detected connection condition.

Moreover, the cited description in column 8, lines 40-64 of the Arai et al. patent, of a camera that detects whether or not an interchangeable lens is properly attached to the camera's body, does not make up for the claimed features missing in Ikeda et al. According to Arai et al., when a proper connection of a detachable lens unit LU is detected by way of a detachable switch 35 in the main camera body CU, a switching circuit 38 is activated to supply a drive power voltage from the battery 37 to each camera portion. (See column 6, line 64 to column 7, line 7.) The detachable switch 35, however, does not appear to supply any information other than whether it is ON or OFF (i.e., only one of two binary states). Consequently, the signal supplied from the switch 35 when a proper attachment of the LU is made causes the switching circuit 38 of the camera to always supply power to the camera portions in the same way regardless as to which lens unit LU is attached to the camera body CU. That is, there is no teaching or suggestion in Arai et al. of "a power supply controller for *selectively controlling power supply in the main camera body in accordance with a result of the detection*," where the detection is of a "condition of a *proper* connection of said image sensing unit to said camera body," as claimed.

For at least these reasons, amended claim 1 recites a combination of features not taught or suggest in the proposed combination of Ikeda et al. and Arai et al. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness does not exist with respect to these documents and claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1. The rejection of dependent claim 5 should be withdrawn at least for the above reasons, and further for the additional features recited.

**Dependent Claims 2, 3, 24, 25 and 28**

The Office Action includes rejections of claims 2, 3, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Arai et al. and Kido, and a rejection of claim 28 under Section 103 as allegedly being obvious over Ikeda et al. in view of Arai and U.S. Patent No. 5,895,127 to Yamamoto. In view of the above amendments, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

With respect to claims 2 and 3, these claims depend from amended claim 1, which recites subject matter not believed taught or suggested in the proposed combination of the Ikeda et al. and Arai et al. patents. It is further submitted that the cited disclosure in Kido of providing a flash control circuit in the body of a camera, does not make up for the deficiencies noted above regarding the Ikeda et al. and Arai et al. patents. Hence, claims 2 and 3 are allowable at least for the reasons pointed out above for claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to dependent claims 24, 25 and 28 have rendered moot the rejection of these claims. Additionally, because each of dependent claims 24, 25 and 28 now depend from independent claim 22, each of these dependent claims is believed allowable for reasons given above. It is further submitted that the cited disclosure in Yamamoto of replacing an interchangeable lens with a personal computer interface does not make up for the alleged subject matter relied upon from the overcome Sato patent.

While additional features recited in dependent claims 2, 3, 24, 25 and 28 set forth combinations of features including further points of distinction, because the distinctions of their respective parent claims are clear, Applicants will not belabor discussion of each and every rejected dependent claim at this time. Applicants note, however, that further distinctions exist therein.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the rejections of the pending claims under Sections 102 and 103 should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that new claims 29 and 30 each recite subject matter not described in or suggested by the Ikeda, Yamagishi et al., Kido, Arai et al., and Yamamoto patents. Accordingly, these claims are patentable.


The application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and prompt notice of the same is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 14, 2004

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
John F. Guay  
Registration No. 47,248

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620